

March 25, 2004

INITIAL STUDY FORM

1. Project Number(s)/Environmental Log Number/Title:

TPM 20718; ER #03-01-001; Avolo Minor Subdivision

2. Description of Project:

The proposed project is the subdivision of 7.26 acres into 3 parcels ranging in size from 2.00 acres net to 2.83 acres net. The project site is located off of Olive Hill Road in the Bonsall Community Planning Area. Rainbow Municipal Water District will provide water and North County Fire Protection District will provide fire service. The project site is located within the Fallbrook Union High School District and the Bonsall Union School District. All parcels will be on individual septic systems. Earthwork will involve the cut and fill of 200 cubic yards of material. Maximum cut slope ratio will be 2:1 at a maximum height of 3 feet, and maximum fill slope ratio will be 2:1 at a maximum height of 1 foot.

3. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Avolo, LLC
5960 Riley Street
San Diego, California 92110

4. Project Location:

The project is located off Olive Hill Road on Villa del Cielo Drive in the Bonsall Community Planning Area.

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1067 F1

5. Surrounding Land Uses and Environmental Setting:

Surrounding land uses include rural residential and agricultural uses to the north, south, east and west. The project site formerly contained an orchard, of which most trees have been removed. The topography on-site is relatively flat.

6. General Plan Designation

Community Plan:	Bonsall
Land Use Designation:	(17) Estate Residential
Density:	1 du/ 2, 4 acres

7. Zoning

Use Regulation:	RR
Density:	1 du/2 acres
Special Area Regulation:	None

8. Environmental resources either significantly affected or significantly affected but avoidable as detailed on the following attached "Environmental Analysis Form".

Biological Resources

9. Lead Agency Name and Address:

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B MS O650
San Diego, California 92123-1666

10. Lead Agency Contact and Phone Number:

Christine Stevenson, (858) 694-3685

11. Anticipated discretionary actions and the public agencies whose discretionary approval is necessary to implement the proposed:

Permit Type/Action

Agency

Minor Grading Permit
Grading Permit
Improvement Plans

County of San Diego
County of San Diego
County of San Diego

12. State agencies (not included in #11) that have jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project:

California Department of Fish and Game

13. Participants in the preparation of this Initial Study:

Chris Stevenson, Department of Planning and Land Use
Lorrie Bradley, Department of Planning and Land Use
Stephanie Hall, Department of Planning and Land Use
Robert Forsythe, Department of Planning and Land Use
Susan Hoang, Department of Public Works

14. Initial Study Determination:

On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use believes that the proposed project may have a potentially significant effect on the environment. However, the mitigation measures described in the attached Environmental Analysis Form have been added to the project which clearly reduce the potentially significant effects to a level below significance. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

CHRISTINE STEVENSON, Planner
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
Regulatory Planning

Date: March 25, 2004

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FORM

DATE: March 25, 2004

PROJECT NAME: Avolo Minor Subdivision

PROJECT NUMBER(S): TPM 20718; ER #03-01-001

EXPLANATION OF ANSWERS:

The following questions are answered either "Potentially Significant Impact", "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated", "Less Than Significant Impact", or "Not Applicable" and are defined as follows.

"Potentially Significant Impact." County staff is of the opinion there is substantial evidence that the project has a potentially significant environmental effect and the effect is not clearly avoidable with mitigation measures or feasible project changes.

"Potentially Significant Impact" means that County staff recommends the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project.

"Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated." County staff is of the opinion there is substantial evidence that the project may have a potentially significant adverse effect on the resource. However, the incorporation of mitigation measures or project changes agreed to by the applicant has clearly reduced the effect to a less than significant level.

"Less Than Significant Impact." County staff is of the opinion that the project may have an effect on the resource, but there is no substantial evidence that the effect is potentially significant and/or adverse.

"Not Applicable." County staff is of the opinion that, as a result of the nature of the project or the existing environment, there is no potential for the proposed project to have an effect on the resource.

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING

1. Would the proposal potentially be in conflict with any element of the General Plan including community plans, land use designation, or zoning?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policies 1.3 (EDA) Estate Development Area and General Plan Land Use Designations (17) Estate. The General Plan requires minimum gross

parcel sizes of 2 acres where the average slope of the proposed parcel does not exceed 25 percent and 4 acres where the average slope of the proposed parcel is greater than 25 percent. The proposed project has gross parcel sizes and density that are consistent with the General Plan. The project is subject to the policies of the Bonsall Community Plan. The proposed project is consistent with the policies of the Bonsall Community Plan. The current zone is RR.5 Use Regulation, which require a net minimum lot size of 2.0 acres. The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements for minimum lot size.

2. Would the proposal potentially be in conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?

Less Than Significant Impact.

In the review of the project, no conflicts with environmental plans or policies adopted by other agencies have been identified. These agencies include, but are not limited to: the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, the San Diego Air Pollution Control District, California Department of Fish and Game, the U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife Service, the State Department of Health Services, and the County Department of Environmental Health.

3. Does the proposal have the potential to be incompatible with existing or planned land uses or the character of the community?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed use will not have a harmful effect on the neighborhood character because the area surrounding the project site is developed with estate residential. To the north, south, east and west are residential land uses. The proposed project is for a residential land use proposing 0.47 dwelling units per acre. Therefore, this project will be compatible with the existing character of development and planned land use.

4. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project is a minor subdivision, which does not propose major roadways, physical barriers or other features that would have the potential to significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

1. Would the proposal convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use; or have a potentially adverse effect on prime agricultural soils as identified on the soils map for the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site contains Unique Farmland. However, the project site does not currently support any agricultural operations. The soils on-site are not considered to be prime agricultural soils. The project site encompasses a relatively small area of land, 7.26 acres. The project is adjacent to agricultural uses to the east and west. However, the remainder of surrounding parcels in the area have residential structures and uses. This proposal is consistent with surrounding uses. Therefore, a significant conversion of farmland resources to non-agricultural use would not occur.

2. Would the proposal conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The surrounding area contains agriculture, which is not under a Williamson Act contract. However, the proposed use does not propose to significantly alter agricultural uses to non-agricultural uses. The proposed project is a subdivision of 7.26 acres into three parcels. The parcel was formerly an agricultural orchard, but the majority of trees have been removed. The project is zoned RR – Rural Residential. This proposal is consistent with the zone. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract.

3. Would the proposal involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to a non-agricultural use?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The surrounding area contains agriculture uses. The parcel was formerly an agricultural orchard, but the majority of trees have been removed. The proposed use does not propose to significantly alter the surrounding area's agricultural uses to non-agricultural uses. The proposed project a subdivision of 7.26 acres into three parcels.

III. POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. Would the proposal potentially induce substantial growth either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project does not involve substantial extensions of utilities such as water, sewer or new roads systems into previously unserved areas and is consistent with the County General Plan. The project will not induce substantial growth not consistent with County planning goals.

2. Would the proposal displace a potentially significant amount of existing housing, especially affordable housing?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project will not displace existing residential uses because the site is currently vacant. The addition of 3 dwelling units will yield a gain of available housing.

IV. GEOLOGIC ISSUES

1. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to hazards related to fault rupture (Alquist-Priolo Zone), seismic ground shaking, seismic ground failure (liquefaction), rockfall, or landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project is not located in a hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1994, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant increased erosion or loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact.

According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as FaD2, BID2 and BIC. The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes. The project is required to comply with the Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING) of Division 7, EXCAVATION AND GRADING, of the San Diego County Zoning and Land Use Regulations. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion potential.

3. Would the proposal result in potentially significant unstable soil conditions (expansive soils) from excavation, grading, or fill?

Less Than Significant Impact.

A review of the Soil Survey, San Diego Area CA by the U.S. Department of Agriculture has identified the following on-site soils having a HIGH shrink-swell behavior: BID2 and BIC. All other mapped soils on the site have a low to moderate shrink-swell behavior and are identified as stable with no adverse potential for development activity. However, potential impacts as a result of development in the areas with BID2 and BIC will be avoided by compliance with the following measures and/or conditions in the Grading Ordinance Requirements Sections 87.403 and 87.410 specified at the time of the grading permit issuance. A soils report with compaction test is required for all fill that is over 12 inches in depth. DPL Form #73, Certification of Fill Compaction Report, completed by a registered engineer is to be submitted after the grading has been done.

4. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant adverse effect to unique geologic features?

Less Than Significant Impact.

No known unique geologic features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity on the Natural Resources Inventory of San Diego County listed in the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan. Since no unique geologic features are present on the site, no adverse impacts will result from the proposed project.

5. Would the proposal result in potentially significant loss of availability of a significant mineral resource that would be of future value to the region?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project will result in a loss of availability of mineral resources that could be of value to the region. The project is located in a mineral resource area, known as Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3), as identified on maps prepared by the Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1996). This area contains minerals, the significance of which cannot be evaluated from the data available. However, given the current land use and development of the surrounding area, it is highly unlikely that the site would ever be developed for mineral resources.

V. WATER RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal violate any waste discharge requirements?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project proposes a minor subdivision and future construction of three new residences which requires compliance with the San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO). The project applicant has prepared a Stormwater Management Plan for Minor Projects, which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the WPO.

2. Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project lies in the Mission hydrologic subarea, within the San Luis Rey hydrologic unit that is impaired for Coliform bacteria and nutrients. However, the project does not propose any known sources of pollutants, or land use activities that might contribute these pollutants.

3. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant increase in the demand on the local imported water system?

Less Than Significant Impact.

A Service Availability Letter from the Rainbow Municipal Water District has been provided indicating adequate water resources and infrastructure to provide requested water resources.

4. Does the project comply with the County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO)?

Yes

The project applicant has prepared a Stormwater Management Plan for Minor Projects, which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the WPO. This report has been reviewed and accepted by the County Department of Public Works.

5. Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project does not appear to significantly alter the existing drainage pattern. The proposed project will not alter the existing drainage of a stream or river in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site because it does not propose a change in the character of the site.

6. Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact.

According to the drainage study dated October 7, 2003, the proposed project will not alter established drainage patterns of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site, because it does not propose a change in the character of the site. Drainage will flow into existing drainage facilities.

7. Would the proposed project create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

Less Than Significant Impact.

According to the drainage study dated October 7 2003, the proposed project will not increase, create, or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems because it does not propose a change in the character of the site.

8. Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project lies in the Mission hydrologic subarea, within the San Luis Rey hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply; industrial service supply; freshwater replenishment; hydropower generation; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat..

Water quality objectives have been designated for waters of the San Diego Region by the Regional Water Quality Control Board as outlined in chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in chapter 2 of the Plan.

Potential sources of polluted runoff include those associated with three new residences, such as grading activities, construction, irrigation, and vehicular use and storage. The project does not propose new storm water drainage facilities, nor does the project site contain natural drainage features that would transport runoff offsite.

Site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. During construction, the following BMPs will be used: silt fencing, fiber rolls, gravel bag berms, street sweeping and vacuuming, stockpile

management, solid waste management, sandbag barriers, spill prevention and control, and concrete waste management. After construction, asphalt concrete will be placed over roadways and parking lots and outlet protection/velocity dissipation devices will be placed at storm drain outfalls.

The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water, storm water and groundwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds.

9. Would the proposal provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Potential sources of polluted runoff include those associated with three new residences, such as grading activities, construction, irrigation, and vehicular use and storage. The project does not propose new storm water drainage facilities, nor does the project site contain natural drainage features that would transport runoff offsite. Refer to answer 8 for specific stormwater BMPs that will be used to prevent substantial polluted runoff.

10. If the proposal is groundwater dependent, plans to utilize groundwater for non-potable purposes, or will obtain water from a groundwater dependent water district, does the project have a potentially significant adverse effect on groundwater quantity?

Not Applicable.

The project will obtain its water supply from the Rainbow Municipal Water District, which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply.

11. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level?

Not Applicable.

The project will obtain its water supply from the Rainbow Municipal Water District, which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose,

including irrigation or domestic supply, and will therefore not deplete groundwater supplies.

The project proposes to increase the amount of impervious surfaces onsite to approximately 7% of the total site area. However, this should not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. In addition, groundwater recharge is not listed as a beneficial use for inland surface water resources in the San Luis Rey Hydrologic Subarea (903.11). Therefore, the project will not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge that would result in a net deficit aquifer volume or lowering of the local groundwater table.

12. Does the project comply with the requirements of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance?

Not Applicable.

The project will obtain its water supply from the Rainbow Municipal Water District which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply.

VI. AIR QUALITY

1. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly contribute to the violation of any air quality standard or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less Than Significant Impact.

No significant source of either stationary or indirect air pollutants has been identified from the project. The primary source of air pollutants would be generated from vehicle trips associated with the proposed project. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 36 Average Daily Trips (ADT). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the threshold of significance for reactive organic gases (ROG). Therefore, the vehicle trip emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. No other potential sources of air pollutants have been identified from the project. Additionally, the project is not expected to emit any toxic air contaminant or particulate matter based on project description and information submitted.

2. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to any excessive levels of air pollutants?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project is not located near any identified source of noxious emissions and will not expose people to excessive levels of air pollutants.

3. Would the proposal potentially result in the emission of objectionable odors at a significant intensity over a significant area?

Less Than Significant Impact.

No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified within the proposed project. Thus, the project is not expected to generate any significant levels of objectionable odors.

VII. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

1. Would the proposal result in a potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project would not result in a degradation of the LOS of affected roadways. Olive Hill Road (SC 100.1) is designated as Light Collector Road on the San Diego County Circulation Element of the General Plan with a current LOS B (3,000 ADT). The traffic volume from the project is 36 ADT (12ADT/DU x 3DU) would not result in any impacts, degradation, or threshold increases on Olive Hill Road.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant impacts to traffic safety (e.g., limited sight distance, curve radii, right-of-way)?

Less Than Significant Impact.

A private engineer will certify that the project will not have any significant impacts on traffic safety and that adequate sight distance has been provided at the access driveways prior to final occupancy (DPW Final Condition B.3) and that all driveways are built to County and Fire Protection District standards (see DPW Final Conditions B.4.a and C.1.b).

3. Would the proposal potentially result in insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The Zoning Ordinance Section 6758 Parking Schedule requires two on-site parking spaces for each dwelling unit. The proposed lots have sufficient area to provide at least two on-site parking spaces consistent with the Zoning Ordinance.

4. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant hazard or barrier for pedestrians or bicyclists?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project will not have any significant increase in the traffic volume on Olive Hill Road or any other County roads in the area. The project does not propose any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists, nor will it affect existing conditions on Olive Hill Road or any other County road in the area for pedestrians or bicyclists. Any required improvements will be constructed to maintain or improve existing conditions as they relate to pedestrians and bicyclists.

VIII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects, including noise from construction or the project, to an endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats?

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.

The site is a former agricultural orchard, where the majority of trees have been removed. The site now contains 0.2 acres of orchards and vineyards and 6.7 acres of non-native grassland. No endangered, threatened or rare plant or animal species protected by the County of San Diego or State and Federal wildlife agencies are expected to occur on-site.

The County considers non-native grassland a sensitive habitat if it is either 5 acres in size or less than 5 acres but connected to at least 5 acres of native or naturalized habitat. The 6.7 acres grassland on site provides foraging habitat for raptors in the local area. To mitigate for the loss of this resource, purchase of 3.3 acres of non-native grassland habitat or habitat credit within a County-approved location is required. With mitigation

incorporated, the loss of this non-native grassland habitat will be less than significant.

2. Does the project comply with the Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Article IV, Item 6) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Yes.

Off-site mitigation will be required to mitigate for loss of 6.7 acres of non-native grassland. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Article IV, Item 6 of the Resource Protection Ordinance.

3. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects to wetland habitats or wetland buffers? Is the project in conformance with wetland and wetland buffer regulations within the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Not Applicable.

The site contains no wetland habitats as defined by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance. The site does not have a substratum of predominately undrained hydric soils, the land does not support, even periodically, hydric plants, nor does the site have a substratum that is non-soil and is saturated with water or covered by water at some time during the growing season of each year.

4. Does the proposed project have the potential to discharge material into and/or divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel or bank of any river, stream, lake, wetland or water of the U.S. in which the California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers maintain jurisdiction over?

Not Applicable.

The proposed project site does not contain any wetlands, rivers, streams, lakes or waters of the U.S that could potentially be impacted, diverted or obstructed by the proposed development. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands, rivers, streams, lakes or water of the U.S in which the California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers maintain jurisdiction over.

5. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects to wildlife dispersal corridors?

Less Than Significant Impact.

No linear features (drainages, ridges, valley or linear-shaped patches of native vegetation) that connect areas of native vegetation or natural open space were identified on the site. In addition, the site is surrounded by agricultural and rural residential uses. Therefore, the site is not expected to be used as a wildlife dispersal corridor and will not impact the dispersal of wildlife.

6. Does the proposed project conform to the Multiple Species Conservation Program and Biological Mitigation Ordinance?

Not Applicable.

The proposed project and any off-site improvements related to the proposed project are located outside of the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program. Therefore, conformance with the Multiple Species Conservation Program and the Biological Mitigation Ordinance is not required.

7. Does the proposed project conform to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings?

Not Applicable.

While the proposed project and off-site improvements are located outside of the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program, the project site and locations of any off-site improvements do not contain habitats subject to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance. Therefore, conformance to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings is not required.

IX. HAZARDS

1. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Not Applicable.

The project is not located on a site listed in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. In addition, an internal review of

existing data and a field visit to the project site did not indicate the presence of any historic burnsites, landfills, or uses that may have contributed to potential site contamination. Therefore, no significant hazard to the public or the environment is expected to occur due to project implementation.

2. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly interfere with the County of San Diego Operational Area Emergency Plan or the County of San Diego Operational Site Specific Dam Failure Evacuation Data Plans?

Not Applicable.

The project lies outside any mapped dam inundation area for major dams/reservoirs within San Diego County, as identified on inundation maps prepared by the dam owners.

3. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the fire hazard in areas with flammable vegetation?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project will not significantly increase the fire hazard because it will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Uniform Fire Code, Article 9 and Appendix II-A, Section 16, as adopted and amended by the local fire protection district. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the Tentative Map, Tentative Parcel Map, or building permit process. Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter, dated November 7, 2002, has been received from the North County Fire Protection District.

4. a. Would the proposal expose people or property to flooding?

Less Than Significant Impact.

According to the drainage study dated October 7, 2003. The proposed project will not expose people or property to flooding because it does not propose to impair, impede or accelerate flow in any watercourse. The project does not have significant flood hazards from external sources.

- b. Does the project comply with the Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Article IV, Section 3) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Yes.

The project is in compliance. The project is adjacent to a floodway/floodplain fringe area, but there are no proposals for any offsite uses or improvements that are subject to the Resource Protection Ordinance.

5. Will the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Not Applicable.

The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it has neither a commercial nor industrial use and does not propose the storage, use, transport, disposal, or handling of Hazardous Substances.

6. Will the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Not Applicable

The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it has neither a commercial nor industrial use and does not propose the storage, use, transport, disposal, or handling of Hazardous Substances.

7. Is the project within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school that will emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste in a quantity equal to or greater than that specified in subdivision (a) of Section 25536 of the Health and safety Code? Or, does the project involve the proposal of a school that is within one-quarter mile of a facility that exhibits the above characteristics?

Not Applicable.

The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

8. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Not Applicable.

The proposed project is not located within any airport's Comprehensive Land Use Plan, nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport that has not adopted a Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Therefore the project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

9. For project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity (1 mile) of a private airstrip. Therefore the project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

X. NOISE

1. Would the proposal result in exposing people to potentially significant noise levels (i.e., in excess of the San Diego County Noise Control Regulations)?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposal would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

Transportation (traffic, railroad, aircraft) noise levels at the project site are not expected to exceed Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)=60 decibels (dB) limit. Noise impacts to the proposed project from adjacent land uses are not expected to exceed the property line sound level limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance.

2. Would the proposal generate potentially significant adverse noise levels (i.e., in excess of the San Diego County Noise Control Regulations)?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposal would not generate potentially significant adverse noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the proposal create potentially significant adverse effects on, or result in the need for new or significantly altered services or facilities? This could include a significantly increased maintenance burden on fire or police protection, schools, parks, or other public services or facilities. Also, will the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Rainbow Municipal Water District and the North County Fire Protection District will provide water, and fire services. The service letters are based on the project's ability to meet the requirements set by these agencies. The schools indicate that the project is eligible for service. Individual homes will be served by on-site septic. Septic layout for the three parcels was approved by the County Department of Health on July 27, 2001. Villa Del Cielo accesses the project and existing 40-foot wide private road; therefore, emergency access is adequate.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICES

Would the proposal result in a need for potentially significant new distribution systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

Power or natural gas;
Communication systems;
Water treatment or distribution facilities;
Sewer or septic tanks;
Storm water drainage;
Solid waste disposal;
Water supplies?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project will not result in the need for significant new distribution systems or substantial alterations to existing systems because the existing utility systems listed above are available to serve the proposed project. See Section XI for specific details on availability and/or conditions.

XIII. AESTHETICS

1. Would the proposal result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project is not visible from a designated scenic vista, overlook or viewpoint according to the Scenic Highway Element of the General Plan; therefore, a demonstrable potentially significant adverse effect is not foreseen.

2. Would the proposal result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse visual effect that results from landform modification, development on steep slopes, excessive grading (cut/fill slopes), or any other negative aesthetic effect?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project will not require significant alteration of the existing landform. The project does not propose any grading or development on steep slopes. The average slope for the property is less than 15 percent gradient. Therefore, the resultant development will have no visual impact from landform modification or grading.

3. Does the project comply with the Steep Slope section (Article IV, Section 5) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Yes.

The average slope for the property is less than 15 percent gradient. Slopes with a gradient of 25 percent or greater and 50 feet or higher in vertical height are required to be placed in open space easements by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO). There are no steep slopes on the property. The project is in conformance with the RPO.

4. Would the project produce excessive light, glare, or dark sky impacts?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project design has not proposed any structures or materials that would create a public nuisance or hazard. The project conforms to the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (San Diego County Code Section

59.101). Any future lighting would be regulated by the Code. The proposed project will not generate excessive glare or have excessive reflective surfaces.

XIV. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal grade or disturb geologic formations that may contain potentially significant paleontological resources?

Less Than Significant Impact.

A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History indicates that the project is not located on geological formations that contain significant paleontological resources. The geological formations that underlie the project have a low probability of containing paleontological resources.

2. Does the project comply with the Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Article IV, Section 7) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DPLU archaeologist Gail Write conducted an archaeological field survey on March 20, 2003 on APN 121-172-19 (Avolo TPM) to determine the presence or absence of culturally significant artifacts or features. The property consists mainly of moderately-sloped old orchard lands with only a few trees remaining. Most of the parcel had a heavy ground cover of non-native grasses resulting in poor ground visibility. The parcel was heavily disturbed from agricultural activities. No artifacts or features were observed; the survey was negative and no further archaeological work is needed for this project.

3. Would the proposal grade, disturb, or threaten a potentially significant archaeological, historical, or cultural artifact, object, structure, or site which:
 - a. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions;
 - b. Has particular quality or uniqueness (such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type);
 - c. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person;

- d. Is listed in, or determined to be eligible to be listed in, the California Register of Historical Resources, National Register of Historic Places, or a National Historic Landmark; or
- e. Is a marked or ethnohistorically documented religious or sacred shrine, landmark, human burial, rock art display, geoglyph, or other important cultural site?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DPLU staff archaeologist Gail Wright conducted an initial site survey and found no potentially significant archaeological, historical, or cultural artifacts, objects, structures, or sites.

XV. OTHER IMPACTS NOT DETAILED ABOVE

None.

XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- 1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project will result in the loss of 6.7 acres of non-native grassland, provides foraging opportunities for raptors in the local area. To mitigate for the loss of this resource, purchase of 3.3 acres of non-native grassland habitat or habitat credit within a County-approved location is required. With mitigation incorporated, the loss of this non-native grassland habitat will be less than significant.

DPLU staff archaeologist Gail Wright conducted an initial site survey and found no potentially significant archaeological, historical, or cultural artifacts, objects, structures, or sites.

- 2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?

Less Than Significant Impact.

In the completion of this Initial Study, it has been determined that no significant unmitigated environmental impacts will result from the project. Thus, all long-term environmental goals have been addressed.

3. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

Less Than Significant Impact.

The incremental impacts of the project have not been found to be cumulatively considerable after an evaluation of all potential impacts. After careful review, there is no substantial evidence that any of the incremental impacts of the project are potentially significant. The impacts of the project have therefore not been found to be cumulatively considerable. The potential combined environmental impacts of the project itself have also been considered in reaching a conclusion that the total cumulative effect of such impacts is insignificant.

4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantially adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact.

In the completion of this Initial Study, it has been determined that the project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. This conclusion is based on the analysis completed in Sections: I, Land Use and Planning; III, Population and Housing; IV, Geologic Issues; V, Water Resources; VI, Air Quality; VII, Transportation/Circulation; IX, Hazards; X, Noise; XI, Public Services; XII, Utilities and Services; and XIII, Aesthetics. In totality, these analyses have determined that the project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

XVII. EARLIER ANALYSIS

Earlier CEQA analyses are used where one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration.

1. Earlier analyses used: None.
2. Impacts adequately addressed in earlier CEQA documents. The following effects from the above checklist that are within the scope of, and were analyzed in, an earlier CEQA document: N/A
3. Mitigation measures: N/A

XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Stormwater Management Plan for Minor Projects, Patrick Harrison, January 8, 2003.

Drainage Study/Hydraulic Calculations for TPM 20718, Patrick Harrison, received by DPLU on October 7, 2003.

Vegetation Map, DPLU, September 22, 2003.

Air in San Diego County, 1996 Annual Report, Air Pollution Control District, San Diego County

Bay Area Air Quality Management District - Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, April 1996

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines 1997

California State Clean Air Act of 1988

County of San Diego General Plan

County of San Diego Code Zoning and Land Use Regulation Division
Sections 88.101, 88.102, and 88.103

County of San Diego Code Zoning and Land Use Regulation, Division 7,
Excavation and Grading

County of San Diego Groundwater Ordinance (Chapter 7, Sections 67.701
through 67.750)

County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan (especially Policy 4b,
Pages VIII-18 and VIII-19)

County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Chapter 4, Sections 36.401 through 36.437)

County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426, County Codes §§ 67801 et seq.), February 20, 2002

County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance (Performance Standards, Sections 6300 through 6314, Section 6330-6340)

Dam Safety Act, California Emergency Services Act; Chapter 7 of Division 1 of Title 2 of the Government Code

General Construction Storm Water Permit, State Water Resources Control Board

General Dewatering Permit, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

General Impact Industrial Use Regulations (M54), San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

Groundwater Quality Objectives, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board's Basin Plan

Health and Safety Code (Chapters 6.5 through 6.95), California Codes of Regulations Title 19, 22, and 23, and San Diego County Ordinance (Chapters 8, 9, and 10)

Resource Protection Ordinance of San Diego County, Articles I-VI inclusive, October 10, 1993

San Diego County Soil Survey, San Diego Area, United States Department of Agriculture, December 1973

Special Publication 42, Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones Act, Title 14, Revised 1994

U.S. Federal Clean Air Act of 1990

Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production-Consumption Region, 1996, Department of Conservation, Divisions of Mines and Geology